

students; 3,000 fewer Federal law enforcement officials; 1,500 fewer air traffic controllers; 30 fewer toxic waste sites cleaned.

That is just a brief snapshot of a number of programs that are targeted to youth or children, or in terms of some of the services that people are expecting that could be reduced or cut under that budget proposal. That is one of the figures that we have.

Because President Bush's budget fails to specify what he would cut, it is impossible to determine which programs would be cut less deeply and which would be cut more severely than this. For each program held harmless, the cuts in remaining programs will exceed 7 percent by that much more.

Are we entitled to know the whole range? Isn't it only responsible, though, that we are able to say, well, we are willing to accept that, or how many hundreds of billions of dollars in terms of tax? Shouldn't that be the nature of the debate? Why do we have to scrounge around and try to get these kinds of figures that are being kept away from us? They are not in any document here. These are the extrapolations based on the Congressional Budget Office of programs in our particular committee jurisdiction, for the most part. And we see what the impact would be. Should or shouldn't we have that debate, whether it is in these areas here or the whole range of different areas of need we have seen in recent times in the areas of education?

I will just take a few more minutes, Mr. President, to look again at the Federal share of education funding. Referring to this chart, funding for early and secondary education has declined since 1980 from 11.9 percent to 8.3 percent in the year 2000. Higher education has seen these reductions. We are going down in terms of the participation. Again, it isn't just money solving all the problems, but there has been a partnership among the Federal, State, and local communities, and our primary responsibility is for those children who are economically disadvantaged.

We said in the early 1960s that for children who were particularly economically disadvantaged, we ought to, as a nation, help local communities. That is basically the Federal involvement in terms of helping local communities. That was what we accepted as part of a national commitment, that we were going to try to provide some help and assistance. And we have seen that go down.

Yet what is happening on the other side of this? We see that in the year 2000 we have 53 million children going to school, and the total number of children going to school is going to effectively double in future years. The number of children who are going to school will double. Are we going to have this kind of a debate on the budget in relation to that?

This chart shows the flow lines, with the growth to 94 million children going

to school as compared to the 53 million children going to school in 2000.

Shouldn't we, if we are going to at least begin to recognize that there is this partnership, say that in those out-years perhaps we ought to—if we are going to have those surpluses; and certainly no one can guarantee it—look at not just what the needs are today, but we ought to be looking down the road in terms of what we are going to do in terms of a national priority?

The chart I was just showing was in relation to elementary and secondary education. What we see with this chart is the corresponding escalation in terms of the total number of children who are going to higher education. That is enormously important in terms of acquiring different kinds of skills so that they are going to be able to be important players in a modern economy. Everyone has understood that for the longest period of time.

We ought to have that debate—whether this budget that we should have next week is going to take into consideration the long-range interests, not just the problem that we have \$130 billion of needs currently in terms of bringing our elementary and secondary schools up to par, in terms of safety and security, and in terms of their ventilation and electronics so that they will be able to have the modern computers. That is \$130 billion and is not even talking about current needs but about future needs.

Shouldn't we have that out here alongside of what is going to be allocated and expended in terms of this tax cut? But, oh, no, we can't have that. We can't have that. We can't wait 2 weeks. We can't wait 2 weeks, 3 weeks, 4 weeks, to be able to get that information out so we can have that informed debate. No, we are not going to do that.

So I join those who have expressed their concern about this process. I had a good opportunity of listening, with great interest, to my friend and colleague from West Virginia this afternoon back in my office. I hope other Members listened to his excellent presentation in outlining the challenges of this moment because he brings to this debate and discussion not only the sweep of history with his own extraordinary career in public service, but he brings to it, in addition, the most exhaustive understanding and awareness in the history of this institution and its development, and even more than all of that—on top of that, his own experience and his understanding of the history—is his love of the institution and his deep commitment to it.

So, Mr. President, when he warns about the real implications for this institution as a servant of the people, it needs to be a warning that is well heeded. And it is not being well heeded. If we are to move ahead the way it has been outlined that we will by the majority leader and the Republican leadership, at the end of next week this will be a lesser institution in terms of representing the people of this country, and that I hope to be able to avoid.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Massachusetts withhold his suggestion?

Mr. KENNEDY. I withhold, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thanks the Senator.

RECESS UNTIL MONDAY, APRIL 2, 2001, AT 5 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now stand in recess until 5 o'clock p.m. on Monday, April 2, in the year of our Lord, 2001.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 4:16 p.m., recessed until Monday, April 2, 2001, at 5 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 30, 2001:

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JAMES D. BANKERS, 0000
BRIG. GEN. MARVIN J. BARRY, 0000
BRIG. GEN. JOHN D. DORRIS, 0000
BRIG. GEN. PATRICK J. GALLAGHER, 0000
BRIG. GEN. RONALD M. SEGA, 0000
COL. THOMAS A. DYCHES, 0000
COL. JOHN H. GRUESER, 0000
COL. BRUCE E. HAWLEY, 0000
COL. CHRISTOPHER M. JONIEC, 0000
COL. WILLIAM P. KANE, 0000
COL. MICHAEL K. LYNCH, 0000
COL. CARLOS E. MARTINEZ, 0000
COL. CHARLES W. NEELEY, 0000
COL. MARK A. PILLAR, 0000
COL. WILLIAM M. RAJCZAK, 0000
COL. THOMAS M. STOGSDILL, 0000
COL. DALE TIMOTHY WHITE, 0000
COL. FLOYD C. WILLIAMS, 0000

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. MARTHA T. RAINVILLE, 0000

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. DENNIS A. HIGDON, 0000
BRIG. GEN. JOHN A. LOVE, 0000
BRIG. GEN. CLARK W. MARTIN, 0000
BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL H. TICE, 0000
COL. BOBBY L. BRITTAIN, 0000
COL. CHARLES E. CHINNOCK JR., 0000
COL. JOHN W. CLARK, 0000
COL. ROGER E. COMBS, 0000
COL. JOHN R. CROFT, 0000
COL. JOHN D. DORNAN, 0000
COL. HOWARD M. EDWARDS, 0000
COL. MARY A. EPPS, 0000
COL. HARRY W. FEUCHT JR., 0000
COL. WAYNE A. GREEN, 0000
COL. GERALD E. HARMON, 0000
COL. CLARENCE J. HINDMAN, 0000
COL. HERBERT H. HURST JR., 0000
COL. JEFFREY P. LYON, 0000
COL. JAMES R. MARSHALL, 0000
COL. EDWARD A. MCILHENNY, 0000
COL. EDITH P. MITCHELL, 0000
COL. MARK R. NESS, 0000
COL. RICHARD D. RADTKE, 0000
COL. ALBERT P. RICHARDS JR., 0000
COL. CHARLES E. SAVAGE, 0000
COL. STEVEN C. SPEER, 0000
COL. RICHARD L. TESTA, 0000
COL. FRANK D. TUTOR, 0000
COL. JOSEPH B. VEILLON, 0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. ROBERT M. CARROTHERS, 0000